



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to exasperate than to moderate, to accumulate accusations rather than maintain the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

War is declared, (on the 20th June, 1812.) against Great Britain, by the United States of America. We pause, in silent sorrow. We are utterly unable to shape our way in the accumulating tempest of the times. Much indeed do we want a pilot that can weather the storm. Experienced as Lord Castlereagh is, in external and domestic war, a civil war in Ireland, a civil war with America, (for what else shall we call it?) an intestine commotion, acknowledged by Parliament, in the heart of England, and added to all this, the management of the House of Commons, surely our Palinurus ought to be watchful through night as well as day. We have only to deplore that popular infatuation, that confident credulity, which, while we are in the midst of breakers, cries out, as it has done, there will be no bill of non-intercourse;—they will submit to our Orders in Council;—there will be no embargo;—there will be no war;—and, even now, it will last but a fortnight, matters will quickly be made up. Such are our bonds of political security.

Instans tamen immemores, cæcique furor:

*Illo subit, media que minans illabitur urbi:
O Patria, O Divum Domus Ilium, et inclyta bello*

Mœnia Dardanidum!

The kingdom of Poland is again to be restored under the auspices of Bonaparte. Without giving him credit for the smallest degree of purity of motive in this plan, the friends of liberty may be allowed sincerely to rejoice in the disappointment of the “crowned robbers,” who, in 1791, agreed to divide Poland among them. Let us remember, that Great Britain silently looked on with ap-

probation. How different now is the state of the three partitioners! Austria and Prussia are humbled at the foot of France. The humiliation of Russia is perhaps at no great distance. A burst of indignation against such lawless aggressions, seizes the mind, but a just retribution of “Measure for Measure,” so speedily succeeding, administers some consolation.

It is reported, on the authority of the French, that the Turks have refused to ratify the peace with Russia.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Proprietors of the Belfast Magazine.

MENTION having been made in the pages of your Magazine of Dr. Dickson's Narrative; and particular allusion having been made to the General Synod of Ulster, you will, no doubt, proceed, in a future Number, to animadvert on the proceedings of that body, relative to the Doctor; and on Dr. Black's statement, to be published at their request. I forbear, therefore, for the present, entering into the merits of the question, farther than to remark briefly on the explanation relative to Dr. Dickson, which the Synod have exhibited in the Newspapers. I have lately heard much conversation on this subject, and hope that the following observations will appear to be not unworthy of notice.

Dr. Dickson having conceived that the phrase “implicated in treasonable or seditious practices,” was unfairly applied to him, very properly demanded of the Synod an explanation of the words. The Synod, however, declined complying with his request, and probably would have continued to dismiss every application of that sort, had not his publication called for the animadversion of the body. But where the

mistatements and misrepresentations in the Doctor's book were to be exposed, an explanation of the offensive phrase was deemed a necessary introduction, that so the candour and fairness of the Rev. body might appear in a favourable light. This was the more expedient, as the Doctor had charged the Synod with dissingenuity in not attending to his very reasonable application. How far the circumstances justified this change of measures every candid man will judge.

Well : having now thought it convenient, on their own account, to explain their own language, what sort of explanation do they give? They might, I think, with great propriety, have said that this late Synod could not stand accountable for all the expressions of a former Synod. They might, without loss of character, have acknowledged that they conceived the term *implicated* too strong for the Doctor's case, inasmuch as he had never been charged with seditious or treasonable practices, nor brought to trial. This would have been truth and justice. But how do they proceed? Why,—they go on to attach a meaning to the offensive phrase, which no judge of language can, in fairness, acknowledge it can bear. While they really acquit the Doctor of having been “implicated in treasonable or seditious practices,” inasmuch as they allege, though without proof of

any kind, that he was confined only on *suspicion* of treason or sedition, they retain the expression and endeavour to explain it away. The Synod had no proof, on which to ground a minute, that he was confined even on *suspicion* of treason or sedition. Government did not publicly say so; and surely, therefore, the Synod had not authority even for saying that the Doctor was *suspected* by government. This might have been the case; but there is no official document by which it can be proved. In my mind, therefore, the Synod should have acknowledged that it appeared to them that the expression “implicated,” &c. was too strong, and that it might be amended thus:—“that two persons belonging to the body were confined by government.” This would have been true; and by such language they never could have been accused of partiality by the world.

With regard to the mis-statements alleged against the Doctor, this is another matter. And even though he should be able to show that he was misinformed, this will not justify his conduct in traducing a public body, whose character should be so sacred in the eye of the world. But I wait with impatience for Dr. Black's statement, and in the mean time am

Yours truly,
A LOVER OF TRUTH.

SIGNATURES OBTAINED TO THE PETITION OF PROTESTANTS IN FAVOUR OF CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION.

Signatures obtained at Downpatrick.

Adam Martin
Robert Davidson
William Hanna
Samuel Thompson
Gordon Bigham
James Quail
Thomas M^r Kelvey
Joseph Robinson

James Crawford
Wm. Sharman, Waringstown
John Wallace
Aynsworth Pillson
John Lowry, Killileagh
Samuel Woods
William Dunlap
Overstreet Carson

Thos. Jackson, Portaferry
William Hastings, Down
Thomas Nevin,
Alexander Miller
John Miller
James Hastings
James Curry.